

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present Application. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present Application. Claims 1, 29, and 38 are amended and claims 21-22 and 32-33 are canceled. Reconsideration of the present application in view of the following remarks and above amendments is respectfully requested.

Rejections based on 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

A) Applicable Authority

“A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” *Verdeggal Brothers v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir.1987). “The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the . . . claim.” *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir.1989). *See also*, MPEP § 2131. The prior art reference must also disclose those elements “arranged as in the claim.” *Connell v. Sears, Roebuck & Co.*, 722 F.2d 1542, 1548 (Fed. Cir. 1983).

B) Anticipation Rejection Based on U.S. Patent No. 6,651,062 (“Ghannam”).

Claims 18-26 and 29-38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Ghannam. Applicant respectfully traverses the anticipation rejection of claims 18-26 and 29-38 because Ghannam fails to describe all elements of amended independent claims 18, 29, and 38.

Amended independent claim 18 recites a method in a computer system having a

graphical user interface including a display and a user interface selection device. The method is for archiving within a client management tool that collects measurements associated with a network and client devices on the network. The client management tool performs both a client management function and an archiving function based on the collected measurements. The client management tool receives an entry selection indicative of a user selection to archive client management data. The client management data comprises at least one of capacity planning data or performance monitoring data corresponding to measurements collected by the client management tool. In turn, the client management tool obtains a selection of a set of client management data and creates an archive file having the selected set of client management data. The client management tool receives another entry selection indicative of a user selection to restore an archived file. The other entry selections is generated by selecting one of the files in a list of archived files.

It is respectfully submitted that the cited prior art, including Ghannam, fails to describe, among other things, *receiving, at the client management tool, another entry selection indicative of a user selection to restore an archived file, wherein receiving the user selection to restore an archive file includes selecting one of the files in a list of archived files*; as recited in amended independent claim 18.

The Office relies upon Ghannam, at FIGs. 2 and 8, col. 6, ll. 41-49; col. 11, ll. 9-29; col. 25, ll. 39-61; and FIGs. 9-14, to anticipate the invention of amended independent claim 18. The cited portions of Ghannam describes a computing system configured to import collected data into a data warehouse. Ghannam further describes managing data transfer via policies configured in a graphical user interface. Ghannam fails to describe, among other things,

archiving client management data corresponding to measurements collected by a client management tool in archived files and restoring the archived files via a user selection.

Unlike Ghannam, the invention of amended independent claim 18 requires, among other things, receiving, at the client management tool, another entry selection indicative of a user selection to restore an archived file, wherein receiving the user selection to restore an archive file includes selecting one of the files in a list of archived files. Ghannam fails to expressly or inherently describe all elements as arranged or combine in the invention of amended independent claim 18. Accordingly, for at least the above reasons, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the anticipation rejection and allowance of amended independent claim 18.

Dependent claims 19-20 and 23-26 further define novel features of the invention of amended independent claim 18 and depend, directly or indirectly, from amended independent claim 18. Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to amended independent claim 18, dependent claims 9-20 and 23-26 are believed to be in condition for allowance by virtue of their dependency. See 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(c). As such, withdrawal of the anticipation rejection and allowance of dependent claims 9-20 and 23-26 are respectfully requested.

Amended independent claim 29 recites one or more computer storage media having computer-executable instructions for performing a method of archiving within a client management tool that performs both a client management function and an archiving function. The method includes receiving an entry selection indicative of a user selection, at the client management tool, to archive client management data, wherein the client management data

comprises at least one of capacity planning data or performance monitoring data corresponding to measurements for a network and client devices on the network collected by the client management tool. In turn, the client management tool obtains a selection of a set of client management data and creates an archive file having the selected set of client management data. The client management tools generates for display a list of archived files and receives another entry selection indicative of a user selection to restore an archived file for additional client management data collection by selecting one of the files in the list.

It is respectfully submitted that the cited prior art, including Ghannam, fails to describe, among other things, *generating for display, at the client management tool, a list of archived files; and receiving, at the client management tool, another entry selection indicative of a user selection to restore an archived file for additional client management data collection, wherein the step of receiving the user selection to restore an archive file includes selecting one of the files in the list*; as recited in amended independent claim 29.

As discussed above, the cited portions of Ghannam describe a computing system configured to import collected data into a data warehouse. Ghannam further describes managing data transfer via policies configured in a graphical user interface. Ghannam fails to describe, among other things, a list of archived files and restoring at least one archive file in the list.

Unlike Ghannam, the invention of amended independent claim 29 requires, among other things, generating for display, at the client management tool, a list of archived files; and receiving, at the client management tool, another entry selection indicative of a user selection to restore an archived file for additional client management data collection, wherein the step of receiving the user selection to restore an archive file includes selecting one of the files in

the list. Ghannam fails to expressly or inherently describe all elements as arranged or combined in the invention of amended independent claim 29. Accordingly, for at least the above reasons, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the anticipation rejection and allowance of amended independent claim 29.

Dependent claims 29-31 and 34-37 further define novel features of the invention of amended independent claim 28 and depend, directly or indirectly, from amended independent claim 28. Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to amended independent claim 28, dependent claims 29-31 and 34-37 are believed to be in condition for allowance by virtue of their dependency. See 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(c). As such, withdrawal of the anticipation rejection and allowance of dependent claims 29-31 and 34-37 are respectfully requested.

Amended independent claim 38 recites a computer system having a processor, a memory and an operating environment, the computer system operable to execute a method of archiving within a client management tool that performs both a client management function and an archiving function. The method includes receiving an entry selection indicative of a user selection, at the client management tool, to archive client management data, wherein the client management data comprises at least one of capacity planning data or performance monitoring data corresponding to measurements for a network and client devices on the network collected by the client management tool. In turn, the client management tool obtains a selection of a set of client management data and creates an archive file having the selected set of client management data. The client management tools generates for display a list of archived files and receives another entry selection indicative of a user selection to restore an archived file by selecting one

of the files in the list.

It is respectfully submitted that the cited prior art, including Ghannam, fails to describe, among other things, *generating for display, at the client management tool, a list of archived files; and receiving, at the client management tool, another entry selection indicative of a user selection to restore an archived file, wherein the step of receiving the user selection to restore an archive file includes selecting one of the files in the list*; as recited in amended independent claim 38.

As discussed above, the cited portions of Ghannam describe a computing system configured to import collected data into a data warehouse. Ghannam further describes managing data transfer via policies configured in a graphical user interface. Ghannam fails to describe, among other things, a list of archived files and restoring at least one archive file in the list.

Unlike Ghannam, the invention of amended independent claim 38 requires, among other things, generating for display, at the client management tool, a list of archived files; and receiving, at the client management tool, another entry selection indicative of a user selection to restore an archived file, wherein the step of receiving the user selection to restore an archive file includes selecting one of the files in the list. Ghannam fails to expressly or inherently describe all elements as arranged or combined in the invention of amended independent claim 38. Accordingly, for at least the above reasons, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the anticipation rejection and allowance of amended independent claim 38.

CONCLUSION

For at least the reasons stated above, the pending claims are now in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the pending rejections and allowance of the claims. If any issues remain that would prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned to resolve the same. It is believed that no fee is due, however, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any amount required to Deposit Account No. 19-2112, referencing attorney docket no. MFCP.112965.

Respectfully submitted,

/MONPLAISIR HAMILTON/

Monplaisir Hamilton
Reg. No. 54,851

PAL/mghz
SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.
2555 Grand Blvd.
Kansas City, MO 64108-2613
816-474-6550